



41643/B



Will Stephenson



his book indeeffer







80056

T of  
Folding the 1st  
Laminations  
Laminations  
Laminations

Imprimatur,  
BERN. GARDINER,  
June 30. 1713. Vice-Canc. OXON.

William OXFORD: Charles

Price Six-Pence.

AN ACCOUNT OF  
A  
ROMAN PAVEMENT  
Lately found at  
STUNSFIELD  
IN  
OXFORDSHIRE  
Provd to be 1400 Years Old.

By JOHN POWTER, M.A. Chaplain  
of Christ Church in Oxford, and Rector of  
Stunfield in Northamptonshire.



OXFORD:  
Printed by Leonard Lichfield, for Andrew Peffer,  
Bookseller. And are to be sold by S. Alderman,  
near Stationers' Hall LONDON. 1713.

TO THE

Rev<sup>d</sup> Dr. HOLLAND,

*Doctor of Divinity,*

The very Worthy Warden of Merton  
College in OXFORD.

Reverend SIR!

**I** Have chosen to Dedicate this Trifle to You, as my Patron and Benefactor, tho' I must confess my self at a loss for an Apology for the Dedication. For my Boldness in prefixing so Great a Name, to so small a Thing, is such a Fault as no Clemency, but Yours, wou'd pardon. Yet I hope in a little Time to Publish something else, that, I flatter my self, may be more deserving Your Patronage.

And here now, How justly might I take occasion of falling-in with the prevailing Humour of the Age, of running  
into



## Epistle Dedicatory.

into Panegyrick, as is usual in such Epistles Dedicatory! How justly might I take this Opportunity of extolling those many excellent Virtues and Accomplishments, that shine-out with so great a Lustre throughout Your whole Conduct! How safely might I applaud Your regular and benign Government of Your College, which we are all so sensible of, and happy under! Those excellent Precepts You give, and that shining Example You shew to all under Your auspicious Care and Jurisdiction! How easily might I expatiate upon Your constant and unspotted Loyalty to the Best of QUEENS! Your firm and steady Adherence to the Sound Principles of the Best of Churches, and that in the Times of Difficulty as well as Prosperity! Whilst some People are warp'd by Interest, and bias'd by Preferment, You, (like the constant moving Sun, radiant in the midst of tempestuous Clouds) are still most exactly performing Your Revolution, still doing Your Duty. How might I praise Your Moderation, known unto all Men! Your well-regulated,  
Your



*Your bright, but not burning Zeal in sacred Things! How might I proceed to admire your Private, as well as Publick Endowments; Your Equanimity, and Evenness of Temper; Your Soundness of Judgment, and deep Learning; Your Integrity of Life, and Conversation; Your Discretion, and Graceful Justness of Decorum, so conspicuous in all Your Words and Actions; Your Courteous, Genteel and Generous Behaviour to'ards all Men. But these are Topicks too large to be insisted on in a Dedicatory Epistle, and besides they are such as speak Themselves, and will for Ever speak, Post Mortem loquetur vocalior Fama; and therefore are such as I shall rather endeavour to Copy after, than pretend to Enlarge upon. Integrity and Honesty, Piety and Virtue, are more durable Monuments than the hardest Marbles of the most Illustrious Hero's: For, they not only beget a constant and lasting Tranquility of Mind, not only procure the Good-will and Esteem of Men, but (which is more) they are such as will never fail to entitle You,*

SIR,

Epistle Dedicatory.

SIR, *to the Protection and Benediction  
of Heaven. But*

Serus in Cœlum redeas, diuque  
Lætus interfis Collegio----

*is the hearty Prayer of,*

SIR,

Your most Humble,

Most Faithful, and

Most Obedient Servant,

JOHN POINTER.

An Account  
OF A  
*Roman* PAVEMENT,  
Lately found in  
OXFORD-SHIRE.

JANUARY the 25<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup>.

**I**N the Parish of *Stunsfield*, in *Oxford-shire*, a small Village, Two Miles *North-West* from *Woodstock*, as a Country Farmer (one *George Hannes*) was plowing his Land, his Plow-share happen'd to hit upon some Foundation-Stones, amongst which, he turn'd up an URN; which made the Farmer have the curiosity of searching farther, whereupon he discover'd a Large, and Entire Ancient *Tessellated Roman Pavement*, 35 Foot in Length, and 20 in Breadth, not above 2 Foot under Ground. The Superficies of it is all smooth and level, and compos'd of little square pieces of Brick, and Stone, about the bigness of Dice, generally speaking, but some larger, and some smaller, of 6 different Colours, (*viz.* Blue, Red, Yellow, Ash-Colour, Milk-White, and Dark-Brown) orderly dispos'd into Works, and strongly cemented together, upon a Bed of Mortar, about a Foot in Thickness, supported by ribb'd Arch-Work underneath. This *Pavement*, by its equal Division, into 2 different sorts of Work, should seem to have serv'd for 2 different Rooms: But be that as it will, I choose to consider it, at present, as it is now but One entire *Pavement*.



That part of the Field, where it was discover'd, is call'd *Chest-Hill*, and sometimes *Chest-Hill-Acre* in some old Leases of this Land, being a Rising Ground, about half a Furlong from the *Old Roman Akemansstreet-Way*, and about 3 Furlongs off *Stunsfield Town*.

A late Industrious Author (for whom I have a great Respect, tho' at the same time I have been forc'd, for the Truth's sake, to write against him) has in his 8th Vol. of *L—d*, given the World a pretty large Account of this *Pavement*, and makes no question, but that it is *Roman*; and I know no body that dissents from him in this Particular.

' Altho' it be certain (says he) that other People us'd the same sort of Work, long after the breaking of the Northern Nations into the *Roman Empire*, yet there are no Historians (as I know of) that observe, that this kind of Work was practis'd here in *Britain*, either by the *Saxons*, or by the *Danes*, or by the *Normans*. On the contrary, it is clear, that before the *Normans*, the Buildings in this Isle were very rude and mean: The Architect's were illiterate, and understood nothing of Curious Workmanship, much less cou'd they pretend to the *Opera-Musiva*. And therefore, Page 11th, he very justly concludes this Work to be *Roman*.

And indeed we are sufficiently convinc'd, from several credible Historians, that the *Old Romans* were wont to make such sort of *Pavements*, as were compos'd of little square bits of Bricks and Marbles, about the bigness of Dice; whereof the *Roman Generals*, amongst the rest of their Baggage, were us'd to carry a Quantity, sufficient to pave the Place where they set up the *Prætorium*, or *General's Tent*; or at least, some part of it, as we are particularly informed by *Suetonius* in the Life of *Julius Cæsar*, *In expeditionibus Tessellata & Scetilia Pavimenta circumtulle*. These, if made of small square Marbles of divers Natural Colours, were call'd *Lithospasta*, (i. e. *Tessellatis lapillis strata*) But if of small Bricks or Tiles, artificially ting'd with Colours, anneal'd and polish'd, *Pavimenta Tessellata*, or *Opera Musiva*, i. e. what we call *Mosaic*, but more properly *Musaique Work*. As we learn from several *Roman*, and other Authors, particularly *Varro*,  
Vi-

*Vitruvius, Ausonius, Perraltus, Papinius, Suaresius, Velserus, Kircherus, Goreus, and Bergierius, which last Author gives us a full Account of these Pavements, in the 10th Tome of Grævius's Thesaur. Antiquitat. Rom. pag. 139. — Alia Pavimenta (says he) instrata erant Lapidibus Majoribus, alia Minoribus. Majores voco Lapides, qui trientem & ultra; Minores, qui infra trientem ad fabæ usque parvitatem patent. Hi Sectilia, illi Tessellæ appellantur. — Tessellæ apud nos vulgo in Templis videntur, ubi fere solent esse Coloris simplicis, quandoque Duplicis, in certos ordines digestæ & dispositæ. Vocabantur Sectilia aut Segmenta, quia in minores particulas sectæ ad convenientem proportionem operis conferendi & coagmentandi — Segmentorum Colores, alii erant Nativi, sive ab ipsa Natura; Alii ab arte, sive Picti. — Sectilia Pavimenta primo in usum venerunt circa tempora Catonis (senioris) — Ex Segmentis Pictis proprie constant Opera Musiva vel Musaica. — Pavimenta formæ lapideæ, operis tam Segmentati simplicis quam Musivi, Græcis dicta fuerunt una voce Λιθόσωλα, quasi dicas Lapidibus strata. — Tale forsan fuit Pavimentum ad Tribunal Pilati, Τόπον Λιθόσωλον, Hebraice vero Gabbatha.*

And we are inform'd by *Salmasius*, in his *Pliniana Exercitationes*, that the Superstructures of these Tents were cover'd with *Tiles* and *Slats*, and that the *Parietes*, or *Side-Walls*, were what we call *Tear-Walls*, compos'd of nothing but *Timber* and *Plaster*; the *Insides*, or *Linings* of which *Walls* were adorn'd with *Chequer'd Paintings*, in imitation of the *Pavements*, as we are told by the same aforemention'd Author, *Bergierius*, pag. 141. *Musiva opera maxime serviebant incrustandis Muris & Parietibus, in Templis, Palatiis, Cubiculis Magnatum.* That our *Stunsfield* Tent had such *Side-Walls*, one may guess from the several pieces of *Painted Plastering* found upon the *Inside* of the *Foundation Walls*. And that the *Superstructure* was cover'd with *Slats*, one may guess from the great many *Slats* found amongst the *Rubbish*, mixt with pieces of *burnt Timber*, *Mortar* and *Nails*. And that there were other *Rooms*, contiguous to this chief *Room* of the *Prætorium*, one may guess from the *Foundation Walls* they have discover'd all round it.

And probably those Holes, on each side of the Pavement, serv'd for no other use but to fix in the lower ends of the upright Side-Pieces, that were the main Supporters of the Side-Walls, or, at least, some pieces of Timber, to fix the Frame steady. But our Author has quite another Opinion of these *Holes*, and is pleas'd (page 26.) to call 'em *Channels*, or *Passages*, which he supposes to have been design'd to convey the Heat from a Subterranean *Stove* to every *Room*, and thinks 'em to have been of the same Nature with those mention'd by *Palladio*, in his Tract *De Focis Veterum*, Printed at the end of his *Antiquitates Urbis Romæ*. Indeed the Subterranean *Vault* is shallow enough to be one Continued *Stove*, for the Cavity underneath the Pavement is not Capacious enough for a Man to get under, any otherwise than by creeping upon all Four. But if the *Cavity* did really serve for a *Stove*, one wou'd expect to find some Remains of an *Hypocaust*, some oblong, square, hollow Bricks, that serv'd for that purpose: But there is nothing to be discover'd in this *Subterranean Vault*, but an obtuse sort of ribb'd Arch-Work, and the Bottom cover'd with clean Gravel; whereas had it serv'd for a *Stove*, they would surely have found *Ashes* instead of *Gravel*: Which inclines me to think that this *Vault* cou'd serve for no other use but to keep the upper Pavement dry. I grant, that some of the Luxurious *Romans* might make use of such delicate Fires, such nice Subterranean *Stoves*, in their *Palaces* at Home, but scarce in their *Camps* Abroad; in their *Bagnio's*, but not in their *Tents*. And I don't find that the aforementioned *Palladio* speaks of 'em as us'd any where else; — *Canales* (says he) *illi hodie conspicui sunt in plurimis Edificiis intra & extra Romam, vetustate divulsis*.

Another thing observable, and which our Author takes but little notice of, is the black, whole, and dried Corn, with which our *Stunsfield Pavement* was cover'd, above half a Foot, and in some places near a Foot deep. This *Corn* I suppose to be laid on, on purpose to preserve it. If it be ask'd, How the *Corn* it self could be preserv'd under Ground for so long time? I answer, How were those Subterranean *Trees* preserv'd that have been



often found in *Cornwall*, *Cheshire*, and other Places (often mention'd by *Camden* and *Childrey*) and some *Nut-Trees*, with *Nuts* on 'em, suppos'd to have lain buried there ever since *Noah's Flood*. How are Grapes, Gooseberries, and other Fruits preserv'd under Ground? And why not *Corn* the same way? Indeed Human Bodies rot in their Graves, by reason of their internal Moisture, but *Mummies*, and Bodies embalm'd, are preserv'd from Putrefaction. Witness the *Aegyptian Pyramids*, where have been many Bodies found still entire, that have been embalm'd almost 3000 Years ago. The natural Reason of all which is, that they are preserv'd from Air and Water, which two Elements prey upon all Bodies, even the Hardest and most Compact. And I question not, but our *Subterranean Corn* had been taken up much fresher, had not the *Tumulus*, or Heap of Earth, that lay over it, been worn away of late Years by the Plough, and so the Wet taken it. Another Objection may be this, How do we know, but that this *Corn* might be only the *Corn* that was Sown there? I answer, had it been the *Corn* that was Sown there, from time to time, one wou'd have expected to have found several sorts of Grain mixt together, and all of 'em blended with Earth; whereas the *Corn*, that cover'd the *Pavement*, and lay so thick upon it, was nothing else but *Wheat* only, without any mixture of other Grain, or even of Earth. Which inclines me to believe, that it was dried and laid-on for no other end and purpose, but to preserve the *Pavement*, and keep it dry. For the *Romans*, when they left *Britain*, did use to burn and demolish these *Prætorian Tents*, and bury their *Pavements* (or rather cast *Tumulus's*, or Heaps of Earth over 'em) as being too large and cumberfom for Carriage, after they were made up; and perhaps, not without some thoughts of returning some time or other (as our Author very well observes) and as we know they did several times, to the assistance of the *Britains*, against their then troublesom Neighbours, the *Picts* and *Scots*: For otherwise we cannot conceive, how these *Pavements* cou'd have been conceal'd for so many Hundred Years. That Acre, or Peice of Ground, on which this Tent was Built, had undoubtedly its Name of *Chest-Hill*,

*Hill-Acre*, from the little *Fæditious-Hill*, or *Tumulus*, that was cast over it to conceal it, but after it became Arable Ground, this *Tumulus* was by degrees worn down by the Plough, as that Part of the *Military-Way*, that ran near it, was. And it was call'd *Chest-Hill*, from the old Saxon word *Chester*, or *Ceastre*, or *Castor*; which words were form'd from the *Roman Castrum*, as we learn from Mr. *Burton*, in his Commentary on *Antoninus's* Itinerary through *Britain*, Pag. 41. And as the Rev<sup>d</sup> and Ingenious Mr. *Morton* tells us, in his *Natural History of Northamptonshire*, lately publish'd, pag. 512. The reason of so much Corn in this General or Officer's Tent, was, to be sure, his Provision for his Army, and it might be quickly after Harvest when this Station was deserted, and then not knowing what otherwise to do with this Store, they might put it to this use. For 'tis well known, that the *Roman Tents* had their *Grainaries* amongst other necessary Places, adjoining to 'em; And this Grainary was call'd *Horreum*, in quo condita erat Annona, sive Frumenta & Legumina quæ militibus distruebantur—— As we learn from the *Roman Writers*, particularly *Franciscus Patricius* in his *Res-Militaris-Romana*: In the 949th Page of *Grævius's Thesaur. Antiq. Roman. Tom. 10.*

Another thing very Observable, is the *Coins*, found with the *Pavement*, and which is a good Argument to prove it to be *Roman*: For, as the Ingenious Mr. *Tickell* justly observes, in that excellent Poem of his, on the *Prospect of Peace*, Pag. 10.

*Coins mixt with Medals of immortal Rome,  
May clear Disputes, and teach the Times to come.*

Though our Author, in the very first Page of his Discourse, does positively, and, I think, over-confidently assert, that there were no *Coins* found, and yet concludes the *Pavement* to be *Roman*; quite contrary to *Camden*, and *Plot*, and others, who always conclude thus; That where there are no *Roman Coins* found, there was no *Roman Station*, but rather *Saxon*, or *Danish*. Now if what our Author in this matter so confidently asserts, be true, I dare as confidently assert, that this is the Only *Roman Camp*, in all *Britain*, at which no *Roman Coins* were

were Buried. But, I must beg leave to contradict our Author a little, as to this main Particular: For, the Man that found the *Pavement*, did confess to me, that he found an *Urn* immur'd (which, as I hinted before, was the first occasion of his searching farther; and which, according to his Description of it, does really appear to have been an *Urn*: And most People believe, that he found *Gold Coins* in it, tho' he conceal'd 'em, and probably dispos'd of 'em Privately, for fear, least the *Lord of the Mannor* shou'd lay Claim to 'em: Therefore he wou'd not confess, that he found any thing in the *Urn*, (tho' it is seldom, or never known, that these *Urns* are found Empty) but that as soon as he found it, he immediately ran Home with it, and that upon the setting of it down upon the Stones, it fell all to pieces; I suppose like those *Sepulchral Urns* lately found, in the Inside of the *Old City-Wall*, at *London*; some of which were so tender and rotten, that they immediately crumbled, and fell to pieces. However, there are several Ancient People of this Place, that do solemnly profess, that upon the first discovery of this *Pavement*, they did find, amongst the Rubbish, several *Old Copper Coins*, and Sold 'em to People that came, out of Curiosity, to Visit this Place, as they do ingeniously confess, that afterwards indeed finding (the *Dulcis Odor Lucri*) the Advantage of such *Coins*, they did get a supply of others. Besides, some Ancient Farmers of this Place do say, that they have formerly found such little Old Pieces of Money in Plowing their Land; but then, not knowing the Value of 'em, they were careless of 'em. But now to examine this matter a little more narrowly: The Country-Farmer disowns that he found any *Money* in the *Urn*. What then shou'd induce him, as soon as ever he had found the *Urn*, immediately, and in all haste, to run Home with it, unless he first discover'd *Money* in it? Certainly he wou'd, in the first place, have search'd the *Pot*, and seen whether there was any thing of Value in it, and that was Worth his while Carrying Home? The Top of it was easy to be taken off, if it had any, and the Search was as Easy and Natural. What made him so hasty to run away with it, and leave his Man

and



and Horses in the Field, that were Plowing with him? Possibly his Man might have found a greater Treasure, whilst his Master slept Home with his *Urn*, that, he says, had nothing in it, but Earth. If he had wanted a Spade, or Pick-Ax, to have search'd farther, he had better have order'd his Man to have Shut-off the Horses, and went Home to fetch those Tools, whilst he himself had stay'd to search farther, as he cou'd. So that in short, either we must Conclude, That this Country Farmer was so Stupid and Sottish, and devoid of all Curiosity, as not to stand to Search the *Urn*, before he took the Pains to hasten Home with it (which was Six Furlongs backward and forwards :) Or else, we must conclude, that the Farmer was so much a Scholar as to know, that it was a *Roman Urn*, and therefore Valuable in it self; and that the *Old Romans* were us'd to Bury *Money* in such sort of Pots; and therefore to take it for Granted, that there was *Money* in it, and so run away with it at a venture. But how is it likely, that a poor Country Farmer, shou'd understand what *Roman Urns* were? I'll warrant ye, he had never seen, or heard of any such thing as a *Roman Urn*, in all his Life-time. How then cou'd he know a *Pecuniary Urn* (as I may so call it) from a *Sepulchral Urn*? Or, either from a *Flower-Pot*? Or (to speak more to his Capacity) a *Money-Pot*, from a *Honey-Pot*? I infer therefore, that it is highly Probable, (if not certain) that the Country-man did find a Pot of *Coins* with the *Pavement*. However, he shou'd his Cunning in Concealing it, because (as I hinted before) they did, by the Ancient Statute of *Treasure-Trove*, belong to the *Queen*, or else the *Lord of the Mannor*; for so we are told by the Reverend Dr. *Wood*, in his *New Institute of the Imperial, or Civil Law*, Pag. 89. ——— ‘By the Laws of *England* (says he) *Treasure-Trove*, is, when any Gold, or Silver, in Coin, Plate, or Bullion, has been of Ancient time hidden; wheresoever it be found, and where no Person can prove any Property, it does belong to the King, or some other by the King's Grant.

But to proceed: Our Author, tho' he allows not of any *Coins* found with the *Pavement*, yet in his Discourse, pag. 28. by way of Digression, is pleas'd to deliver his

Opinion concerning the *Romans* hiding their *Coins*, and says, 'He thinks it was upon Prospect of a Return, that the *Romans* hid such vast Numbers of *Coins*: And this they did (says he) not only in the Year 418, and at some other times, but chiefly in the Year 476—— Whereas we find, that they began this Trade of Burying so much *Money* here in *Britain* much Earlier (no less than 349 Years) even as Early as the time of *Vespasian*, which was the Year 69. But this is too much Matter of Fact to be deny'd: However, that he might not take my bare Word for it, I refer him to the learned Sir *Thomas Brown's* Discourse of *Urn-Burial*, (which is annex'd to his *Enquiries into Vulgar Errors*) where Chap. 2d he says —— 'It is not Strange to find *Roman Coins* of Copper and Silver among us (*i. e.* in *Norfolk*) of *Vespasian*, *Trajan*, *Adrian*, *Commodus*, *Antoninus*, *Severus*, *Dioclesian*, *Constantine*, *Constans*, *Valens*, with many of *Victorinus*, *Posthumius*, *Tetricus*, and the 30 Tyrants in the Reign of *Gallienus*, &c. 'Twere endless to multiply Quotations in this Case, I shall therefore mention but one Author more, and that is the Reverend Mr. *Morton*, who in his *Nat. Hist. of Northamptonshire*, pag. 510. tells us of *Roman Coins* found at *Castor* in *Northamptonshire*——'Where (says he) are such Quantities thrown up, that a Man wou'd really think (to use Mr. *Camden's* Expression) *They were Sown there*: Almost all of 'em are of Copper. They are the *Coins* of several Emperors, particularly *Trajan*, *Adrian*, *Aelius Verus*, *T. Antoninus*, *Gordianus*, *Tetricus*, *Maximian*, *Carausius*, *Constantius Chlorus*, *Constantine the Great*, *Crispus*, *Constantius junior*, *Constans*, *Magnentius*, *Valentinianus*, *Valens*.—— And he proceeds to tell us, that the Reverend Mr. *Baxter* of *St. John's College, Cambr.* has the best Collection he has seen of the *Coins* of this Place. So far Mr. *Morton*—— In a word, Perhaps the Custom of Burning Bodies, amongst the *Pagans*, and Burying the Ashes and Bones in *Urns*, and the Custom of Burying *Money* in *Urns*, commenc'd much about the same time; and so was Originally taken from the Custom of Burying the *Naulum Charontis*, or *Charon's Fee*, in the same *Urn* with the Relicks of the Deceas'd. However,

ever, this we may depend upon, if we will believe *Pliny*, who in his *Nat. Hist.* L. 7. C. 54.) tells us, that the Custom of Burying Bodies amongst the *Romans*, began in *Cornelius Sylla's* Time, who, (having violated the Sepulchre of *Caius Marius*, and fearing the like Usage himself) was the First *Patrician* that order'd his Body to be Burn'd after the *Phrygian* manner: which accordingly happen'd A. U. 676. which was 74 Years before our Saviour's Time. And we are told by *Macrobius*, (*Saturn.* l. 7. c. 7.) that the Time of the Cessation of this Practice commenc'd, when the *Roman* Empire became *Christian*, which we know was in *Constantine the Great's* Time, A. C. 306. So that the Duration of this Custom amongst the *Romans* of Burning Bodies, was 381 Years. And so long, and somewhat longer, lasted the *Roman* Custom of Burying Money in Urns, and generally large Quantities of Money too, as we have seen.

Nor can I agree with our Author, that the *Romans* hid their Money (as they did their Pavements) purely upon Prospect of a Return. For granting they hid vast Numbers of Coins, yet I can never entertain such a wild Imagination as to think, That they any where, at any time, hid Numbers vast enough, or Quantities sufficient for the Maintainance of an Army. What Use then cou'd those vast Numbers of Coins be to 'em, if they had Return'd? They might perhaps have serv'd their Generals for a little Pocket-Money for a while, but those Coins divided amongst their Souldiers, wou'd scarce, I am affraid, have been every Man a Penny. The Coins they hid were, for the most part, Copper, some few Silver, but very few Gold. And 'tis well known that the Urns, in which the *Romans* us'd to Bury their Money, were but small. But to make as large Concessions as can be desir'd in this Case, let us suppose, that the Urns in which they Buried their Money, were as large as their Sepulchral Urns (tho' by the bye, it wou'd be very hard to name the Place where such large Urns of Money were ever found) yet, allowing of this Supposition, still I ask, What wou'd One, or even Two or Three such Urns of Money signify towards Maintaining an Army? But, Why do we stand talk-



talking of little Pots and Urns? I shou'd think that whole Chests and Trunks, nay a whole Wagon Load of Money, wou'd scarce be too much for Maintaining an Army in a Foreign Country for any Term of Years. To say nothing of the egregious Folly of leaving any, even lesser Quantities of Money behind 'em, upon a bare uncertain Prospect of Returning, when as the Bringing back with 'em any Quantity of Money, wou'd be neither Troublesome nor Dangerous. For, What Trouble cou'd a Quantity of Money be amongst Heavier Carriages? And, How seldom is it that Armies are Robb'd? Therefore I rather think, that they us'd to leave such things behind 'em, as so many incontestable Memorials of the Once *Roman* Greatness. (Which Custom has been Practis'd by our Own, as well as Other Warlike Nations; as *France*, and *Spain*, and other Countries in *Europe* can witness, and not only so, but another Quarter of the World too: Of which I shall produce but One single Instance, still fresh in some People's Memories, and that is *Tangier* in *Africa*. When King *Charles II<sup>d</sup>*. Demolish'd this strong Place, in the Year 1682. he caus'd a great deal of our *English Coin* to be Bury'd there, as an undoubted Testimony to Future Ages of the *English Prowess*; as I am inform'd by the Honorable Capt. *Bertie* of *Chesterton* in *Oxfordshire*, who was Himself in that Action. I need not mention that well-known Custom, Daily practis'd in This and Other Nations, of Burying Inscriptions and Coins under the Foundations of Famous Buildings, as so many Hints and Memorandums to our Posterity.) And truly it was no small Glory to Ancient *Rome* (the then Empress of the World) to have sent out her Victorious *Legions*, and spread out her Formidable *Eagles*, so Far, as even from One Corner of the World to the Other; and not only to have Conquer'd, but to have maintain'd her Conquests for so long a Space of Time, which, as Historians tell us, was no less than 500 Years. For *Julius Caesar* (in his Comment. *Lib. 4.*) places his First Expedition out of *Gaul* into *Britain*, in the Year when *Cn. Pompey* and *M. Crassus* were both the Second Time Consuls, which (according to the Chronological History of *Helvius*) was

698 Years after the City of *Rome* was Built: The Expiration of the *Roman* Government, when the *Britains* in vain Petition'd for Relief, was (as *Bede* tells us, *lib. i. cap. 13.*) when *Aetius* was the Third Time Consul with *Symmachus*, *Valentinian III.* being Emperor of the *West*, and *Theodosius II.* of the *East*, which was in the Year of the City (according to the aforementioned Chron. Hist.) 1198, which was in the Year of Christ 448, and not as our Author wou'd have it 476. So that the Continuance of the *Romans* here, was exactly the Space of 500 Years. Which, as it was a good Argument of the Extensiveness of the *Roman Power*, so was it a good Reason for their Burying so much *Money*, to refresh the Memory of what stands upon the Everlasting Records of the *Great-British* and *Romish* Annals.

But now 'tis high Time to enquire, What *Roman* Station was here at *Stunsfield*, and to what *Roman* General this *Pavement* did belong? Why our Author (Pag. 4. of his Preface, as likewise in the Body of his Discourse) is of Opinion, — 'That this *Pavement* was the *Pavement* of the Principal Room of a Hall, or *Palace*, that was erected for a *Roman* Officer: And that this Officer was Subordinate to the Famous General *Theodosius*, and that the Hall, or *Palace* (sure not a *Palace* for a Subordinate Officer!) was put up about the Year 367, when *Theodosius* clear'd *Britain* of Barbarous Enemies. Well; and that this *Theodosius* Garrison'd *Alcester* (a Large and well Fortify'd City, 7 Miles off *Stunsfield*) at the same time, with a considerable Number of well Disciplin'd Men. — Pag. 14. He goes on to tell us, That he also set Guards upon the Frontiers, and order'd divers Watches to be plac'd upon the High-Ways. 'Tis possible (he does not say Probable) there were small Garrisons and Camps in divers Places all about, and particularly at *Stunsfield*, on the Hill where this *Pavement* was dug up: And in a Place on the West of *Begbrook* Church, just at the Entrance into the Parish of *Bladon*, commonly call'd *Round-Castle* (which I doubt not, says he, but 'tis *Roman*, and that it was form'd much about the same time with this at *Stunsfield*,) and also at *Combe*, about a Mile Southwards from *Stunsfield*.---

Other

‘Other lesser Houses were also built about these Principal Ones, for necessary Use and Convenience, and the ‘Soldiers lodg’d all round to be ready upon all Emergent Occasions, to hinder any Rebellion or Insurrection, &c.——

Thus has our Author laid out the matter as plain, as if he himself had been an Old Soldier, or at least, an Historian in the *Roman Times*. For my part, I must needs confess, that if I had tumbl’d over all the Histories in the *Bodleian*, or, perhaps, the *Vatican Library*, I believe I shou’d scarce have found out, that *Theodosius* was ever in *Oxford-shire*. I have read, indeed, that *Theodosius* was in *Britain*, that he came to *London*, and from thence steer’d his Course towards the *North of Britain*, and was very Successful over the *Picts*, and *Scots*, and drove them within their own Borders, and so return’d. For before his coming, those *Northern* People were exceeding troublesome to the *Britains*, broke into their Country, and committed great Outrages; for which very reason *Theodosius* was sent for to quell’em; and as soon as he had done so, he made haste back agen to *Rome*; as I learn from *Speed*, and other *British Historians*: But I never knew before, that he ever settled in this *Southern Part of Great-Britain*; or at least, that he ever was at *Allcheester*. And therefore, I can almost as soon believe that *Faustina* was *Hadrian’s* Wife, (as our Author, and no body else but our Author, tells us, page 20.) as that *Allcheester* was ever the Station of *Theodosius*, or *Stunsfield* of his Subordinate Officer. Indeed it must be said in vindication of our Author, that he only delivers his own Private Opinion, because ’tis confess’d that Publick History is silent in this Case; but then it must be confess’d too, that Opinion is generally groundd upon some Reason or other, otherwise in the most natural Construction of it, it is nothing else but meer random Guess. I ask therefore, What Reason our Author had to think that *Allcheester* was the Station of *Theodosius*? Why *Theodosius* rather than any other General? Why not some General that we are sure, from History, settl’d in these *Southern Parts of Britain*; nay, that had his Station in this particular County? As for instance, Why

not



not *Aulus Plautius*, a Roman Prætor, (sent into Britain by *Claudius* the Emperor, Anno Christi 42, or thereabouts) who (as *Dion Cassius*, in his 60<sup>th</sup> Book expressly tells us) took part of the *Dobuni* into his Protection; i. e. (as *Camden* explains it) *Glocester-shire* and *Oxford-shire*? Or, Why not *Julius Agricola*, the Lieutenant of *Titus Vespasian*, Anno Christi 79. who (as we learn from *Tacitus*, that was his Son-in law, and wrote his Life) completed the Roman Conquests here, and settled in this Southern Part of Britain? No, our Author imagines (page 13.) ‘That the Pavement is Barbarous Work, and ‘done in the Decline of the Empire; and that therefore ‘it must have been the Station of some General that ‘liv’d in the Decline of the Empire. And truly very likely. Yet still I ask this Question, Why *Theodosius* rather than any other General that liv’d in the Decline of the Empire? Sure he was not the Only General that liv’d in the Decline of the Empire. I reckon that *Allectus* liv’d in the Decline of the Empire, as well as *Theodosius*; There’s but 80 Years distance between them: I hope those few Years won’t make much odds. Why then shou’d not *Allectus* be as likely a Man, as *Theodosius*? Nay, why not *Allectus* rather than *Theodosius*? Because we have some certain Information that *Allectus* was in these Parts, and settl’d here, and had his Station but 6 or 7 Miles off the Place where this Pavement was found: But we are so far from having any Information that *Theodosius* ever settled in this County, that we have no manner of Information that he ever settl’d any where at all, in Britain. I consult my Friend Mr. *Camden*, sometimes, and wou’d as soon believe him, as any Historian whatever, especially, when back’d by the Learned Dr. *Gibson*; and they are of Opinion, that there was a Roman Station at *Allchester*, (near *Chesterton*, but now in the Parish of *Wendlebury*) 6 or 7 Miles off *Stunsfield*, and just upon the meeting of *AkemanStreet-Way*, and the *Port-Way* from *Wallingford*, which *AkemanStreet-Way* runs in a strait Line from *Allchester* to *Stunsfield*: And that this Station was Founded, and Possess’d by *Allectus* (and not as our Author wou’d have it, *Theodosius*) who was sent into Britain, by *Dioclesian*, in the Year

Year of Christ 287. Mr. Camden's Words are these, page 256. 'Here are some few remains of an *Old Deserted Station*, which they call *Allchester*, perhaps instead of *Ald-Chester*, or the *Old Castrum*, thro' which a *Military-Way* led. (Which Two Names in Mr. Camden's *Britannia* may be easily reconcil'd, by allowing it to be *All-Chester*, in the time of the *Romans*, from *Allectus*; and *Ald-Chester* in the time of the *Saxons*, from the *Saxon Word Eald*, which signifies *Old*). And Dr. Gibson, who has seen this Station, tells us (in page 271. of *Camd. Brit.*) that it is a *Quadrangular Camp*, or *Garison*, and that the Bounds of it are still visible, tho' the Area or Site of it has been for a long time a Part of the Common Field of *Wendlebury*. And the Dr. having perus'd a *Manuscript* that treats of this *Camp*, seems to be of Opinion, that this same *Camp* did belong to the *Roman Emperor Allectus*. For (says he) 'The Reason of the Name is an evidence of its Antiquity, whether we make it (with Mr. Camden) *Ald-Chester*, or *Allecti-Castrum*, from the *Roman Allectus*; an Opinion ingeniously deliver'd and maintain'd, with much show of *Truth*, in a short History of *Allchester*, the Original MS. whereof is in the Hands of the Reverend Mr. *Blackwell*, B. D. Rector of *Brampton*, in *Northampton-shire*. But (continues he) a better mark of its Antiquity is the Situation of it upon *Akemanstreet*, or *Consular-Way*— which runs strait along, as far as *Stunsfield*.

The Ingenious Dr. Plot likewise, who has perus'd the same MS. seems to be of the same Opinion: The *Roman Military-Ways*, says he, lying so very agreeable to it. Page 340. of his *Natural History of Oxford-shire*, he tells us, he met with some Notes in a MS. that lay *Allchester* was the Seat of *Allectus* the Emperor, who having treacherously slain his Friend and Master, the Emperor *Carausius*, basely usurp'd *Britain* for himself, calling this new Seat after his own Name *Allecti-Castrum* (not *Theodosii-Castrum*) since *Allchester*: But it seems it flourish'd not long, for *Constantius Chlorus* being sent against him, by the Emperors, *Dioclesian* and *Maximian*, by the benefit of a *Mist*, landing privately somewhere on the South-Shore, near the Isle of *Wight*, (whether *Allectus* came

came to prevent him) gave him Battle, defeated, and put him to flight towards this his chief *Fortress*, but was overtaken and slain by *Asclepiodotus* one of *Constantius's* Captains (as the Author of this MS. will have it) at *Allesfield*, now *Ellsfield* near *Oxford*, (which he also wou'd have to be a Corruption of *Allectus-Field*) before he could reach it. Thus far *Dr. Plot's* Transcript out of this MS. Which Relation is agreeable to that of the *Roman Historians*, only there is no mention of the Place. To instance but in one, and that is *Aurelius Victor de Cæsaribus*. — *Soli Carausio* (says he) *remissum Insulæ (i. e. Britannicæ) Imperium, postquam jussis ac munimento Incolarum contra Gentes Bellicosas opportunior habitus. Quem sane Sexennio post Allectus nomine, dolo circumvenit. Qui, cum ejus permissu Summæ-Rei præesset, flagitiorum & ob ea mortis formidine, per scelus Imperium extorserat: quo usum brevi, Constantius, Asclepiodoto, qui Prætorianis Præfectus præerat, cum parte Classis ac Legionum præmisso delevit.* — *Hist. Rom. Scriptores Lat. veteres qui extant, omnes, Pag. 622. Tom. I.* Which Relation of this *Roman Historian*, is likewise in all its circumstances agreeable to the Relation of our *British Historians* in this matter, particularly *Mr. Speed* in his *History of Great-Britain*, page 151. — *Carausius*, says he, was kill'd by the Treachery of *Allectus* his Familiar Friend, in the Year 294. — *Constantius Chlorus* hearing of his Death, determin'd the recovery of *Britain*, and after great Preparations, passing the Seas, in a dark Fogg, or Mist, landed his Men upon that Shore. *Allectus*, who had laid to intercept his coming, forsook also the Seas, and meeting with *Asclepiodotus*, a great *Sceneschall* of the *Prætorium*, as a desperate Man hastened upon his own Death: For encountring with him, he neither order'd his Battle, nor marshal'd his Men, but fought at random, very unfortunately: And having put off his Purple Garment, he was among many others slain, when he had held his Estate (i. e. his Government) Three Years.

The aforefaid MS. History of *Allcheester*, written in the Year 1622. after it had fallen into the Hands of *Dr. Gibson*,



*Gibson*, and *Dr. Plot*, at last fell into the Hands of the Reverend and Learned *Dr. Kennet*, who thought good to Print and Publish it to the World, by way of Appendix to his *Parochial Antiquities of Ambrosden and Burcester*, and has given it the Character of a *Credible Relation*, pag. 9. of his said Book. What Collections I have made out of it, are as follow.

*All-Chester*, *All-Caer*, or *Caer-Allect*, was a Wall'd Town that was built (as may be collected by many Probabilities) by *Caius Allectus*, One of the 30 Tyrants, who by slaying his dear Friend and Emperor, *Carausius*, in open Battle, at a Place 2 Miles distant from *Allchester*, call'd after his Name *Carausfield*, now *Caversfield*, (and since more corruptly *Casfield*) obtain'd the sole Government of *Britain*. — The very Entrench'd Sconce of *Caraus's* Camp, where it lay, still appears in the Plain upon *Bayard's-Green*, a Mile, or better, distant from the now Church of *Caversfield*. — This *Allchester* stands in the very Heart of *Akemanstreet-Way*, one of the 4 Great Ways that parts the Land of *Britain*; generally call'd *Erminstreet-Way*, — a Mile from *Birster*, 7 from *Woodstock*, and 9 from *Oxford*. — In the Fore-Front of *Allchester*, *Allectus*, for his better Defence, built a Sconce, or Watch-Tower, the Ruins whereof still appear in a plain Plat of Meadow-Ground, (adjoining to *Allchester*) now the Soil of *Thomas Moyles* of *Caversfield*, Esq; but formerly of a Knight of the Name of *Maund*, where, in our Days, have been digg'd up much *Roman* Money, Brick, Tile, and Pavements of curious wrought Tile of the bigness of a Six-pence, being delicately laid there. — In the Year 1616. an Earthen Pot full of Brass Money, bearing the Stamp, Name, and Picture, some of *Carausius*, some of *Allectus*, was found under the Root of a Tree, in *Steeple-Claydon* Parish, by the great Pond there, in the Woods of that Worthy Knight, *Sir Thomas Chaloner*, Chamberlain to Prince *Henry*: Which may seem, instead of many Authors, to give credit to my History. For it seems to be hid there, what time they went to the Field hard by, and the Hiders being either put to flight, or kill'd, it so continued till it was found by *Sir Thomas's* Woodward, *William Richardson*. *Sir Thomas* taking

(i. e. offering) me the Coins to be inform'd of the Inscriptions what they meant, I found that the one Coin had this Inscription on the Right side — IMP. CARAUS. P.F. AUG. — which I Interpret thus, — *Imperator Carausius Pius Felix Augustus*. And the other Coin had — IMP. C. ALLECT. P.F. AUG. — which I likewise thus Interpret — *Imperator Caius Allectus Pius Felix Augustus*. — Both Emperors Pictures (i. e. Heads) being on the Right side Coronated *Laureate*, and on the other side, both Coins had the Picture of *Pallas*, with an Olive-Leaf in her Right-Hand, reaching it but in token of Peace offer'd: And a Spear in her Left-Hand, that if Peace were refused, then Wars should ensue, &c. — Thus far the Writer of that MS.

The Remarks that the Learned Dr. Kennet, and Dr. Plot have been pleas'd to make on this MS. are these; Dr. Kennet tells us (page 9th of his *Parochial Antiquities*) the Story of *Carausius* and *Allectus* in short is this. — The guard of our Sea-Coasts, from the Infestation of Northern Pirates, was by the Romans committed to a standing Admiral, under the Title of *Comes Littoris Saxonici per Britanniam*. He was Guardian or Warden of the Ports — which Command about the 3d Year of *Dioclesian*, was on petition of *Carausius*, a Native of *Britain*, or *Ireland*, given to him; who took this Opportunity of insinuating to his Country-men, that if they wou'd receive him for their King, he wou'd expel their Foreign Masters, and restore their Native Liberty. Upon this Prospect, he was admitted to the Government of this Isle, and renounc'd all Tribute and Subjection to the *Roman State*: who resenting this defection, sent over *Basianus*; but *Carausius* by the assistance of the *Scots* and *Picts* kill'd him, and defeated his Forces, and maintain'd his Supreme Power for 7 Years: About the Year 292. he was slain by *Allectus* — *Allectus* after 3 Years Reign was slain by *Asclepiodotus*, Anno 294, or 295. — So much for the Story.

The same Learned Historian, speaking of the Coins, and other Remains of Antiquity, found at *Allcheſter*, pag. 13. goes on to tell us, That the Area or Site of *Allcheſter* has been

been for many Ages, an Arable Part of the Common Field of *Wendlebury*; so as the Teeth of Time, and of the Plough, may be thought to have consum'd all the *Roman* Reliques: Yet by walking o'er the Ground, I find it easy to collect many Fragments of Brick, Tiles, Urns, Vessels, and other Materials, all of *Roman* make, and enough to distinguish this from any adjacent Soil. Great Variety and Plenty of *Roman* Money, of such especially, as is dated from the Decline of that Empire, has been within a few Years gather'd and dispers'd. The largest Collection is said to have been in the Hands of Mr. *Lee*, the Proprietor of *Biguel* Farm, in the Parish of *Burcester*: The late Rector of *Wendlebury*, Mr. *Bond*, was by his Parishioners furnish'd with a considerable Number of 'em. And within a few Years, wherein I have apply'd my self to some enquiry, I have procur'd more than 100 several Pieces, most of which have been found by the Children of *Wendlebury*, in following the Plough: They call 'em *Allchester* Coin. (Which, together with some other Coins the Doctor tells me, he has lately given to be repositied in the Library at *Peterborough*, of which he is now the Reverend and Worthy Dean.) There be Footsteps still remaining of this Garison at *Allchester*, in the Names of the 2 neighbouring Villages, *Chesterton* and *Wendlebury*: Of which the former lies contiguous to the Site of the Old City, and seems to have sprung up from the Ashes of it, preserving the Memorial and the Name of *Castrum*, or *Cestre*. The other, tho' a small Village, has swallow'd up the City, and keeps the Site of it within its own Bounds, on the *East* Part of the Common Field. This *Wendlebury* seems to derive its Name from the *Vandals*, who (as *Zosimus* tells us) were sent as Stipendiary Soldiers into *Britain*, by *Probus* the Emperor, whose Coins have been here found.—— Thus far Dr. *Kennet*.

Dr. *Plot*, in his *Natural History* of this County, speaks of several Earthen Pots found in these Parts, some for the use of Urns, some of Lamps, some of Lacrymatories, and others for Vessels of Oyl, and Aromatick Liquors. And what is of more immediate Concern, he relates (page 337.) that he saw, in the Parish of *Wendlebury*, a



great Square Stone, hollow'd round in the Middle, dug up in, or near the Old City of *Allcheſter*, in which there was ſet a Glaſs Bottle fitted to it, containing nothing but ſomewhat like Aſhes, and cover'd over above with another broad flat Stone: Which Bottle he gueſs'd to have been a Veſſel of ſome Aromatick Liquor. Another thing the ſame Ingenious Author takes notice of (in the ſame *Nat. Hiſt.* pag. 334.) is the Pavement found at *Allcheſter*. He ſpeaks of this Pavement under the Character of the moſt eminent of *Roman* Antiquities, made of ſmall Bricks, or Tiles, not much bigger than Dice. Which Pavement (ſays Dr. *Kennet*, pag. 12. of his *Parochial Hiſt.*) does argue this Place to have been the Station of *Allectus*, or ſome other ſupreme General. And give me leave to add, that if the Pavement did not, yet the Coins of *Allectus*, and others, found here, do undeniably prove this to have been the Station of *Allectus*. Yet our Author is pleas'd to contradi&t all this, and ſeems to deny down-right Matter of Fact. For in a Letter of his to the Royal Society, Printed in the 25th Volume of the *Philosophical Transactions*, page 399. he has theſe Words: ~~—~~ 'Tho' the Anonymous Author of 'the *Antiquities of Allcheſter* (at the end of Dr. *Kennet's* ' *Parochial Antiquities of Ambroſden*) derives it from *Allectus*, as if he were the Founder, (of this Station) yet 'there is no Authority, either from Coins, Inſcriptions, 'or Books to countenance the Conjecture. Now if we ſhould grant (what our Author ſeems to contend for) that there were no Coins of *Allectus* found at *Allcheſter*, yet wou'd it not from hence follow, that this was not the Station of *Allectus*. For no doubt when the Emperor *Diocleſian* ſent *Allectus* as his Deputy into *Britain*, he at the ſame time furniſh'd him with a ſufficient quantity of his own Coin, as appears from the abundance of his Coin found there. Nor was there any reaſon for *Allectus's* coining any Money of his own, till he became a ſupreme Governor himſelf.

But after all, notwithstanding what has been brought to prove *Allcheſter* to have been the Station of *Allectus*, yet it muſt be confeſs'd that ſome other General, or Generals after him, might have poſſeſs'd the ſame Station,

tho'

tho' he was the Founder of it. Nay, 'tis beyond dispute, that other Generals after him did possess the same Station: For we know, that *Dioclesian* (who sent *Allectus* into *Britain*) after he had been Emperor some time, made *Maximian*, *Constantius Chlorus*, and *Galerius Armentarius*, Partners with Him in the Empire: As is evident from the Variety and Plenty of Coins found at *Allchester*, as well of Emperors immediately Preceding, as of Emperors immediately Succeeding *Allectus*, down as far as *Constantine*, but no farther; as I am informed by the Learned Dr. *Kennet*. So that you see our Author's Emperor *Valentinian*, and his Deputy *Theodosius*, are quite and clean cut out, as having had nothing to do with this Station at *Allchester*, there being no manner of Authority, either from Coins, Inscriptions, or Books, to countenance our Author's Conjecture, 'That *Allchester* was ever Garrison'd by *Theodosius*. If it shou'd be Objected, That there were Other Emperor's Coins found at *Allchester*, who were preceding *Allectus*, as those of *Claudius* and *Probus*, and consequently that this Station might as probably be supposed to have been founded by Either of Them, as by *Allectus*. I answer, 'tis no more an Absurdity to suppose, that *Allectus* might have made use of some of his immediate Predecessors Coins, than it is for Queen *ANNE*, to make Use of King *William's*, King *James's*, or King *Charles's* Money.

Now, considering the Testimony of the aforementioned MS. and its Agreement with both the *Roman* and *British* Histories, together with the aforementioned Learned Gentlemen's concurring Opinions about it; considering the Tradition of *Allectus's* Settling here, the Remains of his Station at *Allchester* still bearing his Name, and his and other Emperor's Coins found there, who were his Contemporaries or immediate Predecessors (some of which, as of *Claudius II.* and *Dioclesian*, who sent *Allectus* into *Britain*, I had lately given me by the Honorable Capt. *Bertie* of *Chesterton*): These things consider'd, One wou'd think it shou'd be pretty good Evidence to induce any Unprejudiced, any Impartial and Unbias'd Man, to believe that it was *Allectus* (and not *Theodosius*) that was the Chief Governor in these Quar-

Quarters, and the Original Founder of this Station, and consequently that the Subordinate Officer at *Stunsfield* belong'd to the Former, and not the Latter, and that *Stunsfield* Camp was at first erected for an Officer of *Allectus*. For this you see we have (besides the Evidence of Coins) Plain (if not Publick) History back'd with Reason: But for the other, nothing in the World, but meer Fancy and Imagination, without either. And truly, where Publick Histories, Records and Itineraries are silent, there Private Histories and MSS. (especially when we find they do not contradict any Publick Histories, in any Circumstance whatsoever, but rather agree with 'em) methinks shou'd weigh much with any One, that is not obstinately bent to believe nothing but what he reads in *Suetonius*, *Tacitus*, or his own *Livy*. But perhaps the MSS. I am contending for is Unknown: What then? The History may be True and Faithful for all that. But if our Author is so ready to give Credit to an Anonymous MS. that Vouches for the Veracity of *Sir John Mandevill's* History, that every Body knows to be Fabulous, purely because he found it in the *Bodleian* Library, as he tells us in his Discourse by way of Digression, I was going to say, by way of Diversion; I hope he won't scruple to give Credit to a MS. History, that, in the Opinion of several Learned Men, carries the Face of Truth.

As for our Author's other circumjacent Camps and Garrisons, in the Parishes of *Combe* and *Bladon*, and other Places (which he has so cleverly laid out for his *General*) I have nothing to say to 'em, because they either might, or might not, have been *Roman*, for ought that He or I know, he bringing as little Authority for Them, as he has done for Other Camps: Only I cannot but take Notice, by the bye, That he makes That to be *Roman*, which the Learned *Dr. Plot* makes to be *Danish*, I mean his *Round-Castle* near *Begbrook* Church, which methinks carries a Contradiction in the very Name; yet our Author makes no doubt but that it is *Roman*, whereas *Dr. Plot* (*Hist. of Oxford-sh.* p. 344.) gives a very good Reason why he takes it to be *Danish*, and that is because 'tis Round; for that is the general



Distinction (he tells us, p. 341.) between *Saxon* and *Danish* Camps, the one being Round, the other Square. But, to help our Author out at a Dead-lift here, 'tis the Opinion of the aforementioned, and Learned Mr. *Morton*, in his *Natural History of Northamptonshire*, p. 523. That tho' the *Romans* did generally make their Camps of a Square Figure, *Æquilateral*, or Oblong, yet that this general Rule had its Exceptions, and that in some part of the Time in which they Govern'd us, probably towards the Declension of the Empire, they varied from it. For otherwise it will be hard to account for those *Roman* Coins, which are found in great Plenty, and perhaps other Antiquities of that People, in some of these Round or Oval Camps. I should have been apt to have taken those large Square Entrenchments on *Callow Hills* (but a Mile off *Stunsfield* Camp) to have been *Roman* too, but that I pay more Deference to Dr. *Plot's* Opinion than my Own, who takes them to have been the Works of the *Saxons*. The Reason why I should have thought 'em to be *Roman* is this, They tell us that the *Romans*; in fixing their Stations, always pitch'd upon Grounds that were Driest, and that were not Over-look'd by any Neighbouring Hills.—*Ne Mons Castris immineat per quem supervenire Hostis aut prospicere possit quid in Castris agatur*, says *Hyginus Gromaticus de Castrametatione*, as we have it in *Grævius's Roman Antiq.* Tom. 13. Pag. 1021. Now *Callow Hills* being Neighbouring Hills, and being Higher Ground than that on which our *Stunsfield* Camp stands, wou'd be almost Reason enough to induce a Man to believe the Works upon it to have been *Roman*, had not a greater Historian pronounc'd 'em *Saxon*. Tho' had the Dr. liv'd till now, he might perhaps have seen Reason enough to have chang'd his Opinion. But after all, 'tis no Absurdity to say, that the same Camps might have successively belong'd to the *Romans* and *Saxons* both. For my often mention'd Friend, Mr. *Morton*, in his Excellent History of *Northamptonshire*, p. 523. is of this Opinion, and tells us, 'We may well imagine, that these *Roman* Camps, of whatever Form, were made use of by other Nations which Invaded us, and especially by the *Saxons*, 'who

who coming hither soon after the *Romans* left us, found the Rampiers of (at least) some of their Camps but little decay'd, and probably made use of 'em as they had occasion. For which very reasonable Opinion he produces several Instances.

Let us now return to our *Stunsfield* Camp, and consider the Curious *Work* of the *Pavement*, and the main *Figures* upon it. Our Author (Page 13.) is pleas'd to condemn it as Barbarous Work, and says, It does not carry Life enough to make us believe, that it was done in the Flourish of the Empire. And yet I dare appeal to all the World besides, that have seen it, whether or no, considering the Nature of the Work, the Antiquity, and vast Variety of it, it may not be Admir'd as the most Elaborate Piece of *Roman* Workmanship, of this sort, and One of the Finest of the *Tesselated Pavements*, that has been hitherto found out in all *Britain*. A Man upon a nice View of it, observes such an exact Symmetry, and due Proportion in all its Parts, but more especially in the *Human* and *Animal Figures*; where the very Shades, that give Life to all Figures, are visible (as on the Right Leg of the *Man*, and the Right Side of the Circle that encompasses these Figures) insomuch that One cannot forbear commending the perfect Beauty of the Whole. *Quantâ Curâ, quanto Artificio, Veteres hæc Pavimenta elaborarint!* as *Barbarus* expresses it in the 684th Page of *Grævius's Antiquities*, Tom. 10. Allowances must be made for the Decay of the Varnish upon the Stones, and the Largeness of the Stones themselves of which the *Pavement* is compos'd. Had the Materials been Finer, the Work had been Finer: Tho' I think, Fine enough for the Tent of a *Sabordinate Officer*. What I take chiefly to be observ'd in This or Other Works of the like Nature, is the exact Symmetry and Proportion. Let our Author but compare this *Pavement* with those mention'd by Dr. *Plot*, in his *Nat. Hist. of Oxford-sh.* p. 335. Or that mention'd by Dr. *Gibson* in his *Additions to Camden's Britannia*, Pag. 697. Or that mention'd by Dr. *Woodward* lately found near *Bishops-Gate*, in *London*: Or that truly *Gothick* One mention'd in the *Philos. Transf.* p. 324. (which may be allow'd to be Barbarous Work)

Or even that mention'd, and so highly and justly Extoll'd by Mr. *Morton*, in his *Nat. Hist. of Northamptonshire*, p. 527. Or perhaps any other, either formerly or lately found out, excepting only that to be seen before the Altar in *Westminster-Abbey*, (of all which by and by) and I dare say he will be asham'd of the Comparison. Nay, his Own *Picture of the Stunsfield Pavement* (done *Eâ quâ par est Fide ac Diligentia, ut videtur*) is enough to Contradict him. Which Draught (to give the *Callographer* his due) is admirably well taken, only I beg leave to find Fault with the *Animal Figures*, which I can by no means allow to come up to the Original, as to instance but in One or Two Particulars, One is the *Abdomen* of the *Human Figure*, which I take not to be full enough. The Other is the *Thyrusus*, which should not be held in the Left-Hand, but between the Left-Arm. Another thing is the Skirt of his Mantle, which shou'd be made to appear on both Sides his Body. And therefore I thought good (in order to give my Reader a better Idea of these things) to get the bare *External Lineaments* of the main *Figures* Engraven by a very Careful and Skilful Hand, Mr. *Benj. Cole* of *Oxford*, who by several Ingenious Performances in the Art of *Surveying*, has signaliz'd himself to both *Universities*, particularly by those Two *Maps* (lately Publish'd by him) of *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, and 20 Miles round each: As also by a short Treatise (Publish'd by him some Years ago) shewing the Method of taking *Heights* and *Distances*, and *Measuring Land*, &c.

But we need not stand to Dispute much about the Finess or Rudeness of the Work, since we agree so well as to the Age of it: Therefore so much for the Work.

Our Author is no less Positive in giving us an Account of the *Workman*. Pag. 12. he tells us plainly, 'That the Artist, that did this Work, was not only a *Tessallarius*, and a *Maker of Bricks*, but also a *Souldier*. But this sure must be very Improbable, considering the great Danger he must run of losing his Life in a Battle, and the certain Loss the General must sustain in losing a good Workman; and withal, the Difficulty of recovering this Loss, by sending for another Workman, from so

E

distant



distant a Place as *Rome*, if there shou'd be occasion.

Let us now hasten to consider the main *Figures* upon the *Pavement*. Our Author distinguishes these *Figures* into *Human* and *Animal* *Figures*, which Distinction I am forc't, for Method's sake, to comply with, tho' it be Un-Grammatical, and Ill-Logical. *Pag.* 4. of his Preface, and in the Body of his Discourse, he is of Opinion, 'That they are the *Figures*, not of *Bacchus*, but of *Apollo-Sagittarius*, and of a (he knows not what) Fictitious, Monstrous *Animal*; And that these *Figures*, were represented on the *Pavement* on purpose to signify, that the Contrivers of it attributed all the Success, which *Theodosius* had obtain'd against the Northern Barbarous People, to the Providential Care of *Apollo*. Another Reason which he gives, *page* 17. why *Apollo* was put on the *Pavement*, was, 'That the *Romans* might thereby ingratiate themselves the more with the *Britains*, who had a greater Opinion of *Apollo*, than of any other of the *Gods*.

And the Reason he gives for the Figure of the *Monster*, is this, 'To Strike an Awe upon the Minds of the Spectators. So that here we have two different Sorts of *Figures* cleverly put together, by a strange kind of Magick Art, sure, to raise two different Passions in People at once, but to Please and Terrify the same People at the same time. Which truly is strange indeed. But, for my part, I can find nothing in this *Animal*, that is so Terrifying, or deserving the Name of *Monster*.

And as for the Posture that his *Apollo* is in; some take the *Human Figure* to be sitting upon the *Animal*: 'But this (says he, *page* 16.) is a manifest Mistake, he being plac'd standing, and holding up his Right Leg, Almost in the same manner, that we see the Souldier on some of the Coins of *Constantine junior* describ'd, lifting up his Right Leg, and violently pushing with a Sword, or Dagger, at one of the Souldiers that is prostrate beneath. But I must beg leave to dissent from our Author likewise in this Particular: For any one, with Half an Eye, may easily discern that the *Human Figure*, on our *Stunfield Pavement*, is not violently pushing with a Sword,

or Spear, and therefore shou'd be suppos'd to be either in a Sitting, or else in a Dancing Posture.

And as for the *Thyrus* between his left Arm, he knows not what to make of it, or how to reconcile it to *Apollo*, but calls it a *Dart*, or *Javelin*, and wou'd make us believe, that he has seen it adorn'd *Almost* (again) in the same manner in some other Monuments of Antiquity, but mentions none.

And as for the *Cup* in his Right-hand, page 15. he mis-calls it a *Patera*: Whereas a *Patera* is a broad Bowl, or *Basin*, without any Handle to it, being a Vessel us'd in Sacrifices, to pour Wine on the Victims. And thus 'tis represented by *Oisilius* (in his *Thesaurus Numism. Antiq.* pag. 180. Tab. 38. Fig. 2. &c.) where he gives us the Figure of a *Coin*, with *Apollo* upon it, holding a *Patera* in his Right-hand. Sometimes indeed I have seen a *Patera*, represented as a *Bowl*, with One long Handle to it, and so *M. Misson* (in his *Voyage to Italy*, Vol. 1. p. 132.) describes it. What our Author means by a *Patera*, is a *Patella*, a Two-ear'd Bowl or *Basin*, very wide at Top, like a *Punch-Bowl*. But all these are quite different from the Figure on the *Pavement*; for that is nothing else but the *Cup*, or *Cantharus*, dedicated to *Bacchus*, in the shape of a *Simpulum*, or *Chalice*, Big-belly'd, Strait-neck'd, and Narrow-shank'd, with Two Curve Handles to it. So that had our Author took things by their Right Handles, he shou'd have call'd it a *Cantharus*, and not a *Patera*. But to return to our *Human Figure*.

If this *Human Figure* (as he calls it) did really represent *Apollo-Sagittarius*, then I shou'd think that a *Bow* and *Arrows* (with which he is commonly represented) wou'd be more proper in his Hand, than a *Javelin*. But after all, I am apt to think, that our Author has a wrong Notion of *Apollo-Sagittarius*; for *Apollo-Sagittarius* signifies an Angry, and not a Kind, Deity: For his Arrows were always reckon'd fatal. With them he flew *Python*, and with them he kill'd the *Greeks*. And for this reason, in the *Oxford Almanack* for the Year 1711. we find *Apollo* and *Pallas*, both put together in some grand Consult, as being both Warlike Persons. For as the

One is accouter'd with Her *Shield* and *Spear*, so is the other arm'd with his *Bow* and *Arrows*, for some Martial Exploit. Otherwise he lays aside his *Bow*, and takes his *Harp* in hand. I chose the rather to have recourse to an Almanack for Illustration, because it is so easily referr'd to, and so obvious to every one's View. But not to insist upon Almanack-Proofs, tho' *Oxford*: That *Apollo Sagittarius* did bear such a Signification among the Ancients, we are plainly inform'd by *Pierius*, in his 42d Book of *Hieroglyphicks*, Cap. 17. --- *Sagittas* (says he) *Apollinis, Pestilentiam manifestissime significasse, nulli dubium, de quibus late apud Homerum. Haec vero Hieroglyphice Solares Radios indicant corrupto Caeli tractu Contagiem illam dispergentes.* Neither will the Description that the Ancients have left us of *Apollo* in General, serve his turn, or answer the Figure upon the *Pavement*. For *Apollo* is describ'd as a *Youth*, without so much as the Down of a Beard upon his Chin; his Hair long, never cut, but dischevell'd, and as it were flowing with the Wind; He is Crown'd with Laurel; His Garments and Sandals shining with Gold: He holds a *Bow* and *Arrows* in his Right-Hand, and a *Harp* in his Left: Sometimes he has a *Shield* in One Hand, and the *Graces* in the other: At other times he is cloath'd with a *Long Robe*, and carries a *Harp*, and a *Cup of Nectar*, the Symbol of his Divinity. He has a Three-fold Authority, in *Heaven* he is the *Sun*, and so bears the *Harp*, to signify that all things there, are full of Harmony: Upon the Earth he is call'd *Liber Pater*, and and carries a *Shield*, to show him the *Protector of Mankind*: In the Infernal Region he is *Apollo*, and whoever is struck by his *Bow* and *Arrows*, is immediately sent thither. — This full Description of *Apollo*, our Author may please to review in Dr. *King's* Historical Account of the *Heathen Gods* (which I have faithfully Transcrib'd Word for Word,) and therein he will find nothing that answers to the Figure on the *Pavement*, excepting only Two Parts of his Character out of Ten, as, That he was a *Youth*, and that he had a Cup in his Hand. Tho' (now I think on't) even out of these Two Parts, he is, (as we have seen) Mistaken in One; taking a



*Patera* for a *Cantharus*. And this must needs answer the Description of *Apollo*! But where then is his *Harp*? Or, where is his *Shield*? Where are his *Bow* and *Arrows*? Where is his Graceful *Long Hair*? What is become of his *Long Robe*, and his *Sandals* shining with *Gold*? And those other Essential Parts of his Character? Never sure was the great God *Apollo* (the First of all the Offspring of *Jupiter*, and the Chief Head of the *Muses* too) so degraded, disarm'd, and disrob'd, &c. 'Tis well he was only a *Fictitious God*, like our Author's *Fictitious Animal*, and so not able to revenge it. To be despoil'd, in the first place, of his *Harp*, by which (as the Ancients tell us, and they are the best Judges) he shew'd his excellent Skill in *Musick*! Then to be depriv'd of his *Shield*, by which they say he shew'd himself the Protector of Mankind! To be disarm'd too of his *Bow* and *Arrows*, by which he shew'd his Justice, in Punishing Disobedient Mortals! To be stript Naked, and robb'd of his *Long Robe*, by which he shew'd his Majesty! And at last, to be Debas'd so far, as to be laid Prostrate on the Ground, to be Tramp'l'd on under foot! A Statue had been more proper for so Great a Deity: And such a Posture wou'd have suited with *Bacchus* well enough, because he often lays other People on the Ground, when they make too free with his *Nectar*. But so much for the *Human Figure* on the *Pavement*.

Let us now proceed to examine the *Animal* one, by which our Author means the *Quadrupede*. And here we find him very cautious how he gives any Name to that, having had so much Trouble and ill Success in making out the *Human Figure*, and therefore cunningly calls it (as I hinted before) by the General Name of *Monster*: Tho' even here I think he is out too, for I should not think it proper, to call a Beast of an Ordinary Size, and no Extraordinary Shape, by such a Name; at least, not in the Poetical Sence of it, of *Monstrum, horrendum, ingens*.—However our Author, upon Second Thoughts (which they say are Best) disdaining to be Gravel'd in the History of Animals, is at last resolv'd to find a Name for it if he can. Accordingly, Pag. 17. he wou'd fain make it a *Gryffin*, only he could not tell where to find  
any

any Wings for it. So this won't do, till he comes to Pag. 20. and there he thinks he has found out the Mystery, for there he tells us plainly he thinks that the Artist had some regard, in Designing these Figures, to the Story of *Apollo's* Killing the *Python*. (If so, our *Apollo Sagittarius* shou'd change his Name too, and be call'd *Apollo Pythius*.) But hang it, this won't do neither. For, Pag. 21. he tells us, 'That this *Serpent* was of so 'strange and terrible a Kind, that nothing like it had 'hardly been seen or heard of before, that it was sup-'posed to possess Nine Acres of Land, and that none 'were able to give an exact Representation of it. Nay then, since it is Not to be Represented, we may be sure the Artist had no regard to this Story; for the *Monster* upon the *Pavement* happens to be not so Big as the *Man*. Well: What must we make of it then? Why, since this won't do neither, then our Historian (being pretty good at Invention) is at last for making it a *Dragon*. For, Pag. 19. he tells us, 'That if the Artist had no regard 'to the Story of *Apollo Pythius*, yet the Custom of the '*Romans*, using a *Dragon* on their Ensigns, in the latter 'Times of the Empire, wou'd have been enough to 'justify and warrant the Artist in what he did of that 'kind. And now at length I don't at all wonder at our Author's calling this Fictitious Animal a *Monster*: Since, in a few Minutes time, we have seen it chang'd into as many Shapes, as a *Camelion* into Colours: First a *Monster*, then a *Gryffin*, then a *Python*, then a *Dragon*, and in the result, an Anonymous *Monster* again as good as ever.

Now if I may be allow'd to give in my Opinion concerning these *Figures* on the *Pavement*, I dare be bold to assert, that they are the Figures of *Bacchus* and his *Panther*: And that this is no bare Conjecture, no random Guess, or idle Fancy, we may quickly be convinc'd by comparing the Descriptions that the Ancients have given us in their Histories of *Bacchus*, with the Delineations the Artist has given us on the *Pavement*. Now *Pierius* in his *Hieroglyphicks*, *Natalis Comes* his *Mythologia*, *Galtruchius's* History of the Heathen Gods, *Abricius de Imaginibus Deorum*, *Spanhemius* his *Dissertationes de Præstantia & Usu Numismatum Antiquorum*. *Oiselius* in his

his *Thesaurus Numis. Antig.* Ovid's *Metamorphoses.* Alexander Ross. Macrobius. Oppianus: And of late the Ingenious Dr. King, in his Historical Account of the Heathen Gods. These, and several other Authors, do all agree in this general Description of *Bacchus* and his *Panther*. That he was represented as Youthful, Beardless, and Naked, That he was Crown'd with *Ivy*; That he had his *Cantharus*, or *Cup*, in one Hand, and his *Thyrus* in the other, which was a Spear adorn'd with *Vine-Branches* and *Ivy*; and the *Panther* was dedicated to him, as being a Lover of Wine: And lastly, that he was the first that shew'd his Subjects the Magnificence and Solemnity of a Triumph. All which particular Characters do most exactly correspond with the Figures on the Pavement. But to be more particular, and to bring some Quotations out of Two or Three of these Authors of most undoubted Credit; for it would be Endless and Needless to quote 'em all.

*Pierius* in his *Hieroglyphicks* (*Lib. 41. Cap. 15.*) speaking of *Bacchus's* being a Youth; and of the *Ivy* being dedicated to him, says thus — *Hedera Libero-Patri dedicata est, quod illa semper vireat, ut & Ille semper Juvenis.*

The same Author, speaking of his *Thyrus* being adorn'd with *Ivy*, or *Vine-Branches*, has these Words, (*Lib. 41. Cap. 14.*) — *Thyrus, quod Telum est ligneum, circumfusa Hedera coopertum Vini nocumentum Hieroglyphice indicat sub ipsius suavitate latitare. Hinc Macrobius Liberrum-Patrem ait ferire per obliquum, circumfusæ Hederæ latitante mucrone.* — Let me add, that Botanists make *Hedera Virginiana* and *Vitis*, to be Synonymous.

The same Author (*Lib. 51. 17.*) speaking of the *Cantharus* being dedicated to *Bacchus*, gives this compleat Description of it. — *Cantharus Baccho dicabatur, qui pedem habet à latiori ambitu in angustum flexuoso interius ductu se contrahentem, ita ut ea pars tota desidentibus incurvis costulis describatur: mox intumescit in Calicem, quod nomen nostris in sacrificiis tot jam abhinc annis, specie nihil quicquam immutata, receptum est: Hinc iterum angustari incipit, totoque ambitu intro versus incurvari, quo ductu ubi aliquantulum processerit, rursus aperitur, & Cratera in summo patefacit.*

Lib.



*Lib. II. Cap. 20.* He gives this Account of his *Panther*.—— *Cum Panthera ita cum Vino consensum quendam habere videatur, Baccho ea olim fertur dedicata. Sed quoniam sunt qui per Eam Ebriositatem intelligunt, Hieroglyphicum à re ipsa desumptum ego crediderim: Sunt enim Pantheræ Vini admodum avidæ. Spanhemius* likewise, and *Oppianus* are of the same Opinion, as we shall see bye and bye. But our Author, pag. 16. is pleas'd to take upon him to contradict *Spanhemius*, and other eminent Writers, as to this Particular, and says, 'That the *Tyger*, 'or *Panther* (for I think he makes 'em to be all one) was 'not dedicated to *Bacchus*, because he is a Lover of 'Wine, but because *Bacchus* Conquer'd a good part of 'the *Indies*, where was a great number of *Tygers*: For '(says he) the *Cat-Kind*, of which the *Tyger* is one, has 'an Aversion to Water (but, it may be, not to Wine). Now by our Author's good leave, I wou'd call this Trifling. For what signifies it, for what reason the *Tyger* was dedicated to *Bacchus*, if so be he does but allow that That Beast was dedicated to him. And if he will not allow that, he must contradict all the Historians that ever wrot about *Bacchus*.

*Pierius, lib. II. cap. 30.* tells us of an Ancient Coin he has seen, that had *Bacchus's* Head on one side, and his *Panther* and *Thyrus* on the Reverse.——*Vidimus sane Nummum antiquissimum ex ære quod apud Massæos habetur, in quo Liberi caput Juvenile Hedera redimitum; altera vero facie Panthera & Thyrsus pulcherrimo opere cusi sunt. Et in Gallieni plerisque Nummis Pantheræ nota est cum Inscriptione.*—— *Libero P. CONS. AUG. i. e. Libero Patri Conservatori Augusti.* *Oiselius* likewise, in his *Thesaurus Numismatum Antiquorum*, pag. 231. speaking of one of these Coins of *Gallienus*, says thus ——*In hoc Gallieni Nummo Libero-Patri sive Baccho inscripto, cernitur tantummodo Panthera, Animal scilicet Baccho Sacrum.* And gives us a Picture of the *Panther*, which Picture does exactly answer to the Figure of the *Stunsfield* Pavement. The Head, Ears, Eyes, Legs, long Neck, and long Tail, and the Spots, and Shape of the Body; and in short every part is like. The like Figures of the *Panther* are to be seen in *Spanhemius's Dissertat. de Præstantiâ & Usu Numis. Antiq.* p. 206. Also *Gesner's Hist. Animal. l. 1. p. 824* A-

*Abricius de Imaginibus Deorum*, gives us this Character of *Bacchus*. — *Erat Imago sua facie Muliebri, Pectore nudo, Capite cornuto, Vitibusque coronato, qui super Tigride, vel Panthera equitabat.*

*Ovid* in his Third Book of *Metamorphoses*, gives us this Compendious Description of *Bacchus*,

*Ipse, racemiferis Frontem circumdatus Uvis,  
Pampineis agit velatam Frondibus Hastam;  
Quem circa Tigres, simulacraque inania Lyncum  
Pictarumque jacent fera corpora Pantherarum.*

For we frequently find 'em confounded by the Ancients, and often taken the one for the other. *Unde factum etiam* (says the famous aforementioned *Spanhemius*, in his *Dissert. de Præst. & Usu Numism. Antiq.* p. 166.) *ut vulgo Antiquariorum Antesignani obvias in Nummis id genus Feras, promiscue soleant de Tigridibus, Pantheris, aut Leopardis interpretari.*

The same Learned Author *Spanhemius*, in the same Book, and the same and other Pages, gives us this clear Account of *Bacchus* — *Bacchus Panthera vestus. Cujus rei ratio* (says he, pag. 205.) *petita ex Natura & indole Animalis, Vino inprimis dediti, & Vinosi inde ab Oppiano dicti. Hinc mos ille Veterum in Bacchi Simulacris Pantheriscum ad pedes ejus statuendi, in quem Lyæus ille Vinum è Scypho, quem dextrâ tenet, continuo effundit; sinistrâ autem Thyrsam gestat. Cujusmodi plures extant etiamnum, iique insuper Mole, elegantia, Notatione locorum spectabiles inprimis Nummi.*

And now let any Impartial Judge but read these Descriptions that the Ancients have left us of *Bacchus*, and then look upon the Delineations that the Artist has left us upon the Pavement, and see whether they be not Adequate in all respects. Infomuch that I much question whether any Modern Artist now a-days (either *Roman* or *British*) cou'd make a more compleat Representation of *Bacchus*, with the same sort of Materials.

And after all, What more proper Figure in the World for a General, or Officer's Tent, especially for One that had been Victorious, than that of *Bacchus*? It being an

Emblem of Triumph. For *Bacchus* was the first Author of the *Great Triumph*, as *Godwin* tells us, in his 4th Book of the *Roman Antiquities*, pag. 268. And if we look into the 2d Ode of *Horace's* 4th Book, we shall there find him Describing the *Triumph of Bacchus*; from whose Name *Talmuth* (in *Pancirolo. L. rerum deperdit. Cap. de Triumph.*) and several other Authors, do derive this Word *Triumphus*, *Bacchus* being in Greek call'd *Θείαυλος*, which by a little Alteration is made *Triumphus*. But why our Author will not allow the Old *Romans* to have had any thing to do with *Bacchus*, I can't Imagine. I question not for my part, but that the Old *Romans*, especially their Generals, were as Jolly Rogues, and as great Lovers of *Bacchus* as any of the Moderns. Witness the Jolly Emperor *Gallienus*, that lov'd *Bacchus* so well, that he us'd to wear him upon his Coins, or at least, his *Panther*, for the sake of his Master; as we have seen. And witness likewise, the Noble *Cæsar* that was us'd to inebriate his Soldiers, just before a Battle, thereby to fortify their Insides, as well as their Outsides. For as, *Sine Cerere & Baccho friget Venus*, so, *Sine Cerere & Baccho* (ay and Tobacco too) *friget Mars*.

But *Obe jam satis est*, enough (if not too much) of this *Stunsfield Pavement*: Let us now go on in search of some other Pavements. There have been much such other Pavements (the same as to the Nature of the Work, tho' different in the Form) plough'd up some Years ago, at *Great-Tew*, and *Steeple-Aston*, in the same County of *Oxford*, as we are inform'd by *Dr. Plot*, in his *Natural History of Oxfordshire*, pag. 335.

Another Ancient *Tessellated*, or *Musaique Work* (we are told of in the *Philosophical Transactions*, p. 324.) was found in digging a Cellar, about 40 Years ago, at *Leicester*, over-against the Elm-Trees, near *All-Saints-Church*, about a Yard and half under the Common Surface of the Earth. The Figures upon it are those of a Man, a Stag, and a Boy. 'Tis generally call'd *Actæon*, by such Authors as mention it, being a Representation of the Fable, which say, That a Person having found fault with *Venus*, she to be reveng'd of him, engag'd her Son *Cupid* to fall in love with a Monster. O-



Other Pavements we are told of, by the Reverend and Ingenious Dr. *Gibson*, in his *Additions to Camden's Britannia*, that were found in *Wales* — pag. 603. At *Kaer-Went* in *Monmouth shire*, in the Year 1689. (says he) there were 3 Chequer'd Pavements discover'd in the Garden of one *Francis Ridley*; which being in Frosty Weather expos'd to the open Air, upon the Thaw the Cement was dissolv'd, and this valuable Piece of Antiquity utterly defac'd. So that at present there remains nothing for the entertainment of the Curious, but the Cubical Stones whereof it was Compos'd; which are of different Sizes, and Colours, and may be found confusedly scatter'd in the Earth, at the depth of half a Yard. Chequer'd Pavements consist of Oblong, Cubical Stones, commonly about half an Inch in Length; whereof some are Natural Stones, wrought into that Form, and others Artificial, made like Brick. These are of several Colours, as White, Black, Blue, Green, Red, and Yellow; and are close pitch'd together in a Floor of fine Plaister, and so dispos'd by the Artist, with respect to Colour, as to exhibit any Figures of Men, Beasts, Birds, Trees, &c. In one of these Pavements (as the Owner relates) were delineated several Flowers, which he compar'd to *Roses*, *Tulips*, and *Flower de Luces*; and at each of the 4 Corners, a Crown, and a Peacock holding a Snake in his Bill, and treading it under one Foot. Another had the Figure of a Man in Armour, from the Breast upwards. There were also Imperial Heads, and some other Variety of Figures, which, had they been preserv'd, might have been Instructive, as well as Diverting to the Curious, in the Study of Antiquities. In their Gardens, and elsewhere, in this Village, they frequently meet with Brass Coins, which an Ingenious and Worthy Gentleman, of that Neighbourhood, has for some Years Collected.

Another Chequer'd Pavement, the same Learned Author tells us, pag. 607. was discover'd in the Year 1692. in the Grounds of the Honoured *Henry Tomkins*, of *Kaer-Leion*, Esq; in the same County. 'Twas found by Workmen a Plowing, in a Field close adjoining to his House. It lay no deeper than the Plough-share, and that at *Kaer-Went* not much lower. See the Fig. of it in *Cam-*

den, pag. 697. The Diameter 14 Foot. All the Arches, and that part of the Border they touch, were compos'd of White, Red, and Blue Stones, varied alternately. The Bills, Eyes, and Feet of the Birds were Red, and they had also a Red Ring about the Neck; and in their Wings, one or two of the longest Feathers were Red, and another Blue. The inside of the Cups were also Red; and elsewhere, whatever we have not excepted of this whole Area, is variegated of Umber, or Dark-colour'd Stones and White. Mr. *Tomkins* took care to preserve what he cou'd of this valuable Piece of Antiquity, by removing a considerable part of the Floor, in the same order it was found, into his Garden.

Another *Tessellated Pavement* we are told of by the Learned and Ingenious Dr. *Woodward*, of the *Royal Society*, in his Letter to Sir *Christopher Wren*, which Letter is inserted in the 8th. Vol. of *Leland's Itinerary*, put out by Mr. *Hearne*——‘ In April 1707. (says he) upon the pulling down of some Old Houses adjoining to *Bishops-Gate*, in *Camomile-street*, London, in order to the building there a-New; and digging to make Cellars, about 4 Foot under Ground, was discover'd a Pavement, consisting of Diced Bricks, the most of 'em Red, but some few Black, and others Yellow; all near of a Size, and very small, hardly any exceeding an Inch in Thickness. The Extent of the Pavement in Length was uncertain, it running from *Bishops-Gate*, for 60 Foot, quite under the Foundation of some Houses not yet pull'd down. Its Breadth about 10 Foot. Sinking downwards, 4 Foot deeper, they found several Sepulchral Urns, full of Ashes and Cynders of burnt Bodies. Also other Earthen Vessels, as a *Simpulum*, and a *Patera*, of very fine Red Earth, and a Blewish Glass-Viol, call'd a *Lacrymatory*, &c. Also a Human Skull, and Bones, dug up in the same place.

There have been likewise such sort of Pavements found in places where Religious Houses have been built, as particularly at *Woodchester*, in *Glocester-shire*, where in the Church-yard, in digging the Graves, they us'd to find such *Tesseraick* Work of Painted Beasts and Flowers, 2 or 3 Foot deep—— as we are inform'd by Dr. *Gibson*, in his *Additions to Camden*; and Tradition tells

us, that there had been a *Religious House* built there. But our Pavement at *Stunsfield* cannot be supposed to have belong'd to any *Religious House*, or *Temple*, the Figure upon it being so very improper.

At *Bybury* likewise in the same County, (tho', I think, not any *Religious House* there) about 45 Years ago, was found another *Tesseraick Pavement*, compos'd of Marble, and *Roman Bricks*, as I am inform'd by that Ingenious Virtuoso, and my very good Friend, Mr. *Oldisworth*, Stationer in *London*, who had some of the Stones, and whose Father (who had an Estate there) did design to have built over it, but that the Stones were, by degrees, all taken away by great numbers of People that came out of Curiosity to see it.

Likewise the Reverend and Ingenious Mr. *Morton*, my very good Friend too, and Countryman, whom I have had frequent occasion to mention, (in his *Natural History of Northampton-shire*, lately publish'd) tells us of several *Roman Pavements* found in the said County, particularly at *Castor*, where (says he, pag. 509.) 'In digging a little way beneath the now Surface, they frequently meet with small square Bricks, or Tiles, such as the Romans were wont to make their *Checquer'd Pavements* of; and particularly in the place which is now the Church-yard, and on the *North* side of the Town. In digging into that part of the Hill, which the Church stands upon, they find these little Bricks almost every where; sometimes single and loose; sometimes set together and fix'd, or inlaid in a very hard Cement or Mortar. The loose ones appear to have been laid in the same manner as are those which are now found in entire, or unbroken Pavements. A pretty large piece of this sort of Pavement entire, is still to be seen in the Cellar of a House, on the South-side of that Hill. It was found in digging for the Cellar, 3 Foot deep; and has now the Site that it had at first. 'Tis somewhat above 3 Foot in Length, scarce 2 in Breadth. The Bricks that compose it, are like those found in digging in the Church-yard, and elsewhere at *Castor*, about an Inch square. The shape is not exactly the same in all, but they all approach that of a Cube. The Work of that entire Piece is plain, without any Variety of Figures, or of Colours.

The



'The Squares are set in Mortar made of Sand and Lime, with a mixture, as it seems, of the Scales and Dust of a Smith's Forge. In the Field betwixt the Town and River, are found vast Quantities of *Roman Coins*.

But the *Pavement* that most resembles our *Stunsfield Pavement*, only it has no *Animal Figure* upon it, is that remarkable One this same Ingenious Author gives an Account and Plan of, Pag. 527. --- A *Roman Pavement* (says he) discover'd Anno 1699. in *Horse-Stone Meadow* at *Nether-Heyford* in *Northampton-shire*, about Half a Mile from the *Watling-street*--- A most Noble Piece of Art, exceeding all I have seen or read of, of the same Kind in *England*, in the great Variety, in the Regularity, and Beauty of it.--- The whole Work consisted of little Bricks or Tiles artificially ting'd with Colours, and as smooth as Marble: all of 'em Squares, somewhat bigger than common Dice, of 4 Colours, White, Yellow, Red, and Blue, dispos'd into various, regular Figures, which were plac'd with great Exactness.--- By what remains of the *South* side of the *Pavement*, we may learn it was about 15 Foot in Length from *East* to *West*. The Extent of it from *North* to *South*, uncertain; the Discovery not reaching far enough for it. It lay under Ground, cover'd with Mould and Rubbish, in a part of the Meadow which is every Year overflow'd with Land-Floods: And yet when it was first uncover'd, it was so close and firm, as to bear walking upon as well as a Stone-Floor wou'd do. But having lain a while expos'd to the Night-Dews, the Cement became relax'd, and the Squares easily separable. It appears to have been the Floor of a square Room in some House, or other Structure of a Circular Figure, and abovt 20 Yards Diameter; as we may conjecture from the thin and pale Green-sword in this Place, which is different from the rest of the Meadow, and which probably covers the Remains and Ruins of it; for wherever they dig, underneath this discolour'd Green-sword, they meet with Floors, Foundations of Walls, or other Remains of some Ruin'd Building. The Room that had this Curious Floor was in the *Southern* part of the said Structure. In the *Western* and *Northern* part of it were several lesser Rooms, or Cellars, about 10 Foot in Length.

Length, and 4 Broad. That there really were such little Rooms, is plain enough from the Partition-Walls, the Bottoms whereof have been discover'd in digging there. The Stones of the Foundations are small and mean, for a Structure so finely adorn'd as this is within. Some of the Rooms were found Floor'd with a firm Plaster of Lime-Mortar, drawn upon Pebbles fix'd in Lime. The Borders, or Sides of the Floors were painted with 3 strait and parallel Lines, or Stripes of 3 different Colours, Red, Yellow, and Green; so fresh and lively, that when the Floors were uncover'd by the Diggers, the strokes of the Hairs of the painting Brush were plainly visible. No Painting appear'd in the inner part of any of 'em—— The Floors were all upon the same Level—— Upon one of these Floors were found 3 Urns, &c.—— Thus far this Ingenious Author; where, by the bye, it must be observ'd, That he wrote this Account (in which he so highly extols this Pavement) before he had seen our *Stunsfield Pavement*, as he himself told me.

But the Best of this Kind of *Musaique Pavement*, is now to be seen before the Altar in *Westminster-Abbey*, (a Pavement not Unworthy so Sacred a Place) being made of Opake Gems, of various Natural Colours, cut Square by *Lapidaries*, like Dice, some Triangles, and in divers Goons; suited to Meandrick Turnings and Windings, but no Animal Figure represented. Dr. *Fuller* (in his *Worthies of England*, pag. 369.) tells us, 'It was made of Rich *Porphyry*, by certain Workmen brought from *Rome*, by *Richard de Ware*, Abbot of *Westminster*, in the Year 1260.

I might here mention several other *Roman Pavements*, that have been found in *Great Britain*, but these may suffice to give us a Taste, as well of the Antiquity and Rarity, as of the Delicacy and Excellency of the *Roman* Workmanship. I don't doubt, but more of these Valuable Pieces of Antiquity might be found, wou'd Men but be Perswaded to take a little Pains to search for 'em under those *Tumulus's*, or Heaps of Earth, that were cast over 'em: 'Tis very likely they wou'd find either *Pavements* or *Urns*, or some other Reverend Relicks of Ancient Times, under most of 'em.

F I N I S.

# The CONTENTS.

- 1 THE Description of the PAVEMENT. Page 1
- 2 Allow'd by a late Author to be Roman. p. 2
- 3 Prov'd to be so from several Historians. ibid.
- 4 The Fashion of the Super-structure. p. 3
- 5 The Holes on each Side of the Pavement accounted for. p. 4
- 6 No Subterranean Stove. ibid.
- 7 The Corn that cover'd the Pavement accounted for. ibid.
- 8 Roman Coins found with the Pavement. p. 6
- 9 Why the Romans left their Money behind 'em. p. 8
- 10 When they began to hide such Quantities of it. p. 10
- 11 Stansfield Camp belong'd not to Theodosius's Officer, p. 13
- 12 But to Allectus's. p. 15
- 13 MSS. History of Allchester, proving that Allectus had his Station there. ibid.
- 14 Mr. Camden's Opinion of it. ibid.
- 15 Dr. Gibson's Opinion of it. ibid.
- 16 Dr. Plot's Opinion of it. p. 15. 19
- 17 Dr. Kennet's Opinion of it. p. 17, 18, 19.
- 18 The Description of Apollo not agreeable to the Figure on the Pavement. ibid.
- 19 Concerning the Circumjacent Camps. p. 22
- 20 The Curious Work of the Pavement consider'd. p. 24  
N.B. The Pages from 24, to 33, are false Paged.
- 21 Who the Workman was. p. 25
- 22 What the Figures on the Pavement are. p. 26
- 23 That the Human Figure does not represent Apollo. p. 27
- 24 Not a Javelin, but a Thyrsus in his Left-Hand. ibid.
- 25 Not a Patera, but Cantharus, in his Right-Hand. ibid.
- 26 The Animal Figure no Monster. 29
- 27 That they are the Figures of Bacchus and his Panther, p. 30
- 28 The Figure of Bacchus an Emblem of Triumph. 33
- 29 Other Pavements found in This and Other Counties. 34

## AUTHORS mention'd in this small Treatise.

- |                     |                     |                      |
|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 1 Suetonius.        | 16 Aurelius Victor. | 31 Salmuth.          |
| 2 Aufonius.         | 17 Oiselius.        | 32 Burton.           |
| 3 Varro.            | 18 Hyginus.         | 33 Godwin.           |
| 4 Papinius.         | 19 Barbarus.        | 34 Ovid.             |
| 5 Suaresius.        | 20 Grævius.         | 35 Ros.              |
| 6 Velferus.         | 21 Pierius.         | 36 Brown.            |
| 7 Kircherus.        | 22 Pliny.           | 37 Woods.            |
| 8 Vitruvius.        | 23 Bergierius.      | 38 Speed.            |
| 9 Perraltus.        | 24 Naralis Comes.   | 39 Camden.           |
| 10 Goreeus.         | 25 Galtruchius.     | 40 Gibson.           |
| 11 Salmasius.       | 26 Abriicius.       | 41 Plot.             |
| 12 Patricius.       | 27 Spanhemius.      | 42 Woodward.         |
| 13 Helvicus.        | 28 Macrobius.       | 43 Miffon.           |
| 14 Bede.            | 29 Gefner.          | 44 King.             |
| 15 Cæsar's Comment. | 30 Oppianus.        | 45 Kennet.           |
|                     |                     | 46 Morton's History. |

























































